

Speaker Registration/Testimony

Name Kim
 Phone 808-000-0000
 Email kim1542-1@yahoo.com
 Meeting Date 03-22-2017
 Council/PH Committee Council
 Agenda Item CR-73 (Bill 6, CD1)
 Your position on the matter Oppose
 Representing Self
 Organization
 Do you wish to speak at the hearing? No

RECEIVED
 CITY CLERK
 C & C
 2017 MAR 22 AM 6:11

Written
 Testimony

It is, by law, the responsibility of the driver to yield to pedestrians. Therefore, what action the pedestrian is or is not undertaking should be the decision of the pedestrian not the government. This bill proposes to infringe on personal freedom in exchange for some unquantified perception of safety. I have seen no attempt by any party to justify this infringement (for example, by presenting statistics that correlate "viewing" an electronic device with pedestrian detriment). Merely reciting statistics on pedestrian fatalities is not adequate justification for such a ban especially because the cause of each fatality is unreported. The definition of "viewing" in Bill 6 CD1 is overly broad. A mere unintentional glance in the general direction of the screen of an electronic device (or viewing an electronic device to learn the current time as one would glance at a wristwatch) could result in a citation. "Looking in the direction of a mobile electronic device" does not necessarily mean the pedestrian is oblivious to his surroundings nor does it mean his safety is in jeopardy, nor does it mean he hasn't looked both ways before and/or while crossing the street. It is the motor vehicle that threatens the pedestrian, not the phone or pedestrian himself. Pedestrian safety should be addressed through intelligent infrastructure planning and design, not by expanding the power of law enforcement, especially without any clear basis (or because of one constituent's pet peeve: KITV4 reported "Elefante introduced the proposed bill after a community member expressed their concern over too many pedestrians walking across streets with their eyes glued to their mobile devices.") The proposed ban is a heavy handed overreach over an issue that hasn't been proven to be an issue and where the safety of the pedestrian most likely predominantly lies in the hands of the motor vehicle operator not the operator of an electronic device crossing a road way on foot.

Testimony
 Attachment
 Accept Terms
 and Agreement 1

MISC. COM. 1291

PH

3/22/2017